

19-1422  
No. 20-

U.S. SUPREME COURT

CLERK OF COURT

**Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr.**

Chief Justice

NAKISHA JACKSON,

PETITIONER

V.

ROY L. BRUN, Judge; MIKE SPENCE, Caddo Parish Clerk of Court;  
1ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT; STATE OF LOUISIANA

AND

KRISTY WILSON, ET AL

RESPONDENTS

No. 19-cv-1006

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA,  
HONORABLE JUDGE ELIZABETH FOOTE

CASE No. 19-30828  
IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NO. 20-00238  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA  
SHREVEPORT DIVISION

ORIGINAL

FILED  
MAY 28 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---NAKISHA JACKSON/ PRO SE  
PO BOX 202967  
ARLINGTON, TX 76006  
817-240-1571

### **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

1. Is it considered “misrepresentation” when an individual is not registered with the Secretary of State (SOS), in their state, to represent an entity, but publicly requests funding over the internet and reports on the record to maintain a 501(3) c designation that has the same exact name as another national 501(3) c designated entity, that publicizes its financial backing comes from the United States Small Business Administration?
2. There were allegations against me personally for questioning the validity of a charity, not affiliated with my business entity, and notification of these allegations were mailed to my business, via the United States Post Office, where my front office staff is not authorized to receive service on my behalf for personal matters, so does this constitute commencement of legal action?

3. Can personal jurisdiction be obtained over a nonresident without consent as in International Shoe v Washington, 326 US 310 (1945)?
4. If personal jurisdiction is not obtained, and made a special appearance to object and challenge, can it be overruled by the presiding judge and subsequent judgments entered without evidence of the plaintiff making a case for a protective order?
5. If my right to an attorney is denied, in the civil action requesting a protective order, does it pose challenges, if my civil judgment turns into a criminal proceedings to maintain my Sixth amendment right to an attorney for the same case.
6. With appearance of partiality, as demonstrated in Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp., 486 U.S. 847, 108 S.Ct. 2194 (1988), is it still the Court's opinion that if partially can be assumed then

partiality may be present, or does it have to be proven, being that the lower court did not agree with appearance being enough?

7. Is there an inherent disadvantage to proceedings conducted in a Pro Se manner because of the burden on the court if the Plaintiff is pro se and the Court deems it necessary to read the complaint's allegations expansively, especially when faced with a motion to dismiss as stated in White v. Bloom, 621 F.2d 276?
8. Does the suggestion, as described in United States v. Day, 969 F.2d 39, 42 (3rd Cir. 1992), that Pro se litigants' court submissions are to be construed liberally and held to less stringent standards than submissions of lawyers if the court can reasonably read the submissions apply if optional, but preferred, elements are missing?

9. Is a copy of the record from any proceedings a right to a party named in a legal action with or without a lawyer present, and denial of such, a violation Fed. R Criminal procedure, Rule 16. Discovery and Inspection, if the civil case has the ability to progress to criminal proceedings?
10. Considering Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure, Rule 4 appeal as a right, is it within the right of the lower state court to deny an appeal?
11. Do local rules of appellate procedure always supersede federal rules if the requirements made by the local are impeded by the lower court due to violations of the law?
12. Is it unconstitutional for a Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit judge to deny my right to a three panel decision?

13. Does it constitute charity fraud when persons are not registered with the Louisiana Attorney General's office with the understanding that under Louisiana law, charitable organizations that use professional solicitors are required to register annually?
14. Is the SOS universally understood to be the authority to determine whom a legal entity belongs to in a particular state?
15. With the designation of a non-profit organization, for charity purposes, does the public reserve the right to directly question the entity about misappropriation of funds when the solicitation was specific and advertised publicly, but there is no evidence of the activity the money was solicited for?
16. Does an individual that represents herself as a business reserve the right to obtain a protective order as an individual, if that individual states the business was questioned by the public for validity,

is not in a discovery period, has no proof of stalking or endangerment, self-reports that there was limited communication and

there is no personal relationship?

17. Is evidence admissible for granting a protective order for harassment or stalking if the complainant testifies that all correspondence was not addressed to her, was not received directly by her, was not derived from the alleged, or was not given to her by a third party at the request of the alleged?
18. If personal jurisdiction is never obtained in a lower court does subject matter automatically become the responsibility of the federal court able to attain personal jurisdiction over all parties when there is diversity of citizenship?
19. In accordance with 28 US CODE 1331, in what instance does a federal court have the right to

terminate subject matter jurisdiction of an original case based on this code when the complaint alleges federal internet communication, no interaction on state soil, there is diversity of citizenship, and alleged federal crimes have been committed.

20. When the appellate clerk of court answer motions without sufficient knowledge of the law, refuses to act or acts out of order, thwart the delivery of motions, delay the entries, refuse to enter filings, label filings incorrectly does that constitute “fraud upon the court” as described in Bulloch v. United States, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985)?

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Questions Presented.....	i
Table of Contents.....	viii
A table of authorities .....	ix
Petition for Writ of Certiorari.....	1
Opinions Below.....	1
Jurisdiction..... .....	2
Constitutional Provisions Involved.....	2
Statement of the Case.....	3
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	16
To uphold the constitutional rights to a fair trial, to proceed without counsel with the knowing of	

impartiality and fairness by the court, and to express to the lower courts that acting in a manner that is unconstitutional is not conducive to a fair trial, especially when there is substantial evidence to prove a citizen has been falsely accused

Conclusion.....	
.....19	
Appendix.....	
.....separately bound	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<u>Bulloch v. United States,</u> <u>763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th</u> <u>Cir. 1985)</u> .....	iv,18
<u>County of Ventura v. Tillett</u> (1982).....	6
<u>International Shoe v Washington, 326 US 310</u> (1945).....	ii
<u>Levine v. United States,</u> <u>362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960),</u> .....	18
<u>Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.,</u>	

<u>486 U.S. 847, 108 S.Ct. 2194</u> <u>(1988).....</u>	ii, 14
<u><i>Liteky v. U.S.</i></u> <u>114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162</u> <u>(1994).....</u>	18
<u><i>People v. Zajic</i></u> <u>88 Ill.App.3d 477, 410 N.E.2d 626</u> <u>(1980).....</u>	18
<u><i>Pfizer Inc. v. Lord</i></u> <u>456 F.2d 532 (8th Cir.</u> <u>1972).....</u>	14
<u><i>Taylor v. O'Grady</i></u> <u>888 F.2d 1189 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir.</u> <u>1989).....</u>	14
<u><i>United States v. Balistrieri</i>, 779 F.2d 1191 (7th Cir.</u> <u>1985).....</u>	14
<u><i>United States v. Day</i>, 969 F.2d 39, 42 (3rd Cir.</u> <u>1992).....</u>	ii
<u><i>United States v. Sciuto</i>,</u> <u>521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir.</u> <u>1996).....</u>	8
<u><i>White v. Bloom</i>,</u> <u>621 F.2d</u> <u>276.....</u>	iii

## **Statutes**

<b>18 U.S.C. §</b>	
1503.....	16
<b>28 U.S.C. §</b>	
455.....	3
, 18	
<b>28 U.S. Code</b>	
§ 1654.....	17
<b>28 US CODE</b>	
1331.....	vi
<b>42 U.S. Code</b>	
§ 1983.....	3,
16	
<b>FED. R. APP. P.</b>	
4.....	iv
<b>FED. R. CIV. P. 72</b>	
(a).....	7
<b>FED. R. CIV. P. 72</b>	
(b)(3).....	7

FED. R CRIM P.	
16.....	iv

### **Constitutional Provisions**

United States Constitution, Amendment	
VI.....	ii, 18
United States Constitution, Amendment	
XIV.....	2
United States Constitution Article III; Section	
2.....	3

Petition for Writ of Certiorari

I, NaKisha Jackson, domicile to the state of Texas, currently have 4 permanent protective orders issued by the First Judicial District court of Louisiana. I respectfully petition this court for a writ of certiorari to review the judgments of the United States Court of Appeals, 5<sup>th</sup> circuit, the Western District of Louisiana, Shreveport Division, and the First Judicial District Court of Louisiana

Opinions Below

621400-C Earsel Devers, 621424-C Kennedi Baylor, 621423-A Dita Walker AND 617188-B Kristy Wilson, Plaintiffs VS. NaKisha Jackson, Defendant. All ended in permanent protective orders against me from First Judicial District Court Shreveport, LA. (February 28, 2020)

19-cv-1006 NaKisha Jackson vs Roy Brun et al.— Dismissed by LAWD, Shreveport, with prejudice against Roy Brun and Mike Spence for failure to state a claim for which relief is sought and without prejudice against the State of Louisiana for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

19-30828 NaKisha Jackson vs Roy Brun et al—Dismissed by US Court of Appeals 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit for no record excerpts and denied rehearing (May 4, 2020)

20-00238 NaKisha Jackson vs. Kristy Wilson et al---  
Dismissed by LAWD, Shreveport for lack of subject  
matter jurisdiction. (May 21, 2020)

Jurisdiction

I, NaKisha Jackson, was denied a panel hearing and petition for rehearing was denied by the U.S. Court of Appeals, 5<sup>th</sup> circuit on May 4, 2020, due no record excerpts only. On May 6, 2020, I mailed a writ application to the Louisiana Supreme Court, and was notified of its returned for no jurisdiction over the U.S. Court of Appeals 5<sup>th</sup> circuit on May 22, 2020.

My complaint of Malicious prosecution was denied on May 12, 2020, and petition, filed on May 15, 2020, for reconsideration by the Western District Court was denied on May 21, 2020 for malicious prosecution due to fraud and the US 5<sup>th</sup> circuit already denied a panel based on this matter, appears partial, and a fair and impartial hearing is unlikely.

My notice of appeals to the Louisiana 2<sup>nd</sup> circuit from the First Judicial was mailed in a timely manner on February 28, 2020, and I have record of receipt, but they are unanswered. All cases are direct correlations to the initial wrongful judgment against me in the First Judicial

District Court of Louisiana where multiple civil rights violations took place and continue to take place. I invoke this Court's jurisdiction under 28 U.S. Code § 455 and 42 U.S. Code § 1983, having timely filed this petition for a writ of certiorari within ninety days of all judgments entered above.

**Constitutional Provisions Involved**

**United States Constitution, Amendment XIV:**

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any laws which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

**United States Constitution Article III; Section 2**

The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;--to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;--to all cases of

admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;--to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;--to controversies between two or more states;--between a state and citizens of another state;--between citizens of different states;--between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the state where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any state, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

#### Statement of the Case

This writ application is based upon Supreme Court rule 10 (a) (b) and (c) of your published writ grant considerations. This is a civil judgment that can turn into a criminal case against me if it is not handled legally. I was illegally summoned to the First Judicial District Court of Louisiana, as a Texas resident with no long arm met and no crime committed. My business was not involved. This

was a personal attack. I was never served, sent written correspondence of such, and made a special appearance in the First Judicial Court to object to jurisdiction. I was overruled and forced into proceedings. In court, the original plaintiff was pursuing a protective order against me to thwart unwanted questions via her non-profit organization's social media about the validity and legality of her entity. The original plaintiff never went to the police with her manufactured evidence. There was no police report of the alleged harassment. The Caddo parish clerk of court is the only place the evidence was filed. I reported a crime against the original plaintiff in that hearing, stating that she impersonated a nonprofit organization named SCORE that is designed to assist the public with guidance on the proper way to structure business formation to attempt to avoid errors in the future and promote small business success. I am aware of this free service because I took the classes and attribute my success in starting a business to this educational service. The original plaintiff made it a children's charity and solicited the public for monetary donations via a Cash App. The legal version of SCORE is backed financially by the US. Small Business Administration and to my knowledge does not solicit the public via social medial for financial assistance. The Louisiana

Secretary of State does not maintain documentation of legal formation for the original plaintiff's alleged 501(3) c business designation. There was no evidence of harassment presented in court, I reported the financial crime in court and received the judgment. I did not have

time to attain counsel because I was notified by an unauthorized 3<sup>rd</sup> party the day before I was to appear in court in another state. I did not have time in that 24hrs to submit evidence or review all evidence presented against me. I submitted written correspondence to the First Judicial court in that 24hr timeframe stating I was not served and required more time. I am a medical professional and needed to abruptly disrupt patient care for these non-emergent proceedings. The clerk of court for Caddo Parish notified me that my request was denied, and I was to report to court because I could receive a default judgment even though I was not served. I was denied an extension. I was not allowed to examine new evidence that was presented against me in court, unfairly judged, and upon request for the complete record and the transcript, I was denied by the Caddo Parish Clerk of Court. I was denied the right to file an appeal in 2<sup>nd</sup> circuit for the original state case, so I filed a civil rights lawsuit in the Western District of Louisiana against the State of Louisiana and the Caddo Parish Clerk. A judgment void on its face because rendered when the court lacked personal or subject matter jurisdiction or exceeded its jurisdiction in granting relief which the court had no power to grant, is subject to collateral attack at any time. (*County of Ventura v. Tillett* (1982)). In the Western District, I was denied a summons to serve the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana and lied on in an R&R by Magistrate Judge Mark Hornsby. In the R&R, interpretation of the law was loose and not factual. In my specific objections, I proved his claims false and formally denied the court consent to continue my case with the use

of a Magistrate Judge, as is my right according to FED. R. CIV. P. 72 (a) and (b) (3). I submitted a timely summary judgment. It was denied and not reconsidered upon the understanding that it was not premature, which was the only reason given for denial. Subsequent dismissal of my case was based upon the biased R&R by Judge Hornsby, whom I specifically requested to be removed from my case since his R&R said my case warranted dismissal because I had not served any summons, and I had served the Attorney General of Louisiana. Upon appeal, the Fifth circuit clerk sent me personal emails outside of filings, refused filings, and ordered on filings illegally. I was denied consideration for protective order while in a discovery period being that I contacted the IRS tax-exempt department and the Shreveport and New Orleans fraud departments, and I was a viable witness to the crimes against an affiliate of the United States Government. A confession by one of the defendants/participants of the charity fraud ring I testified against was in the possession of all clerks and all courts I had proceedings in and was there before all rulings took place in the Fifth Circuit. My appeal was dismissed due to no record excerpts, with full awareness that I was denied the record excerpts.

Since then, the First Judicial Court has allowed an inherently voided judgment that expired on January 7, 2020, to be modified on January 9, 2020, and entered new harsher judgments against me because I reported the charity fraud. Sciuto, 521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir., 1976). The Court is authorized and required to vacate judgments

and orders entered in a manner inconsistent with due process of law; to wit: A judgment is void if the court that rendered it . . . acted in a manner inconsistent with due process. The new judgments were entered, knowingly, by the same judge, Judge Brun, while he and I were in a court of appeals with him as the defendant. He refused to recuse himself. That court is trying to remove my credibility to be a witness for the US government and the Small Business Administration, ruin my reputation, and hurt my future ability to maintain my livelihood with unwarranted protective as a healthcare provider and small business owner. They have put my life and the life of my employees, patients, and business associates in danger with their reckless pursuit to silence me.

I was denied the opportunity to have my case ruled on by a panel of judges in the Fifth Circuit Court of appeals in New Orleans, LA. Only some of my motions were answered. My brief was in superb condition and had an appendix instead of record excerpts because I requested the record from the Western District Clerk's office and was denied. I did not request an oral argument. I respected the court's time and have submitted all documentation successfully and in a timely manner. I expected in return, fairness and impartial treatment as a pro se litigant and a natural born US citizen who has been wrongfully accused, submitted proof of such, and is aware of errors on the part of the First Judicial clerk, the Western District Clerk, and the Fifth Circuit clerk that negatively affected my opportunity to have a fair hearing. The judges who have entered orders, recommendations, and judgments in this

case have no validity or just cause to their actions and go directly against the evidence.

Since the beginning of this case, the defendants have made errors, not only in these proceedings, but have broken more laws connected to the intent of these proceedings. Employees of the office of the clerk of the Fifth Circuit have been covering for the defendants and cross talking about the matters of this case. The Fifth and Western district clerks appear to be more like counsel for the defendants versus a neutral clerical party. The court's reaction, to dismiss and deny me, on all levels so far, is in response to something they inherently know they did wrong because the law allows me to defend myself with the truth, clear my name, and receive the relief sought.

Obstruction of justice is clear on the part of the Fifth Circuit clerk with the understanding that the United States post office has no delivery notification or signature confirmation on my express mail to the 5th circuit clerk for my February 3 "delivered" motion because they marked it as a delivery attempt. The post office left a notice for the clerk to pick up after refusal to sign, and the post office still has it. The clerk refused the envelope and cross-talked with the defendant and the lower courts to get the title, and then denied the motion, based on the title. That motion specifically requested a judge rule on a protective order

request. I re-submitted for reconsideration after the clerk's denial and asked again that a judge review it because, at the time, I assumed the clerk did not read it because it asked for a protective order, something the clerk cannot grant or deny. It was never answered. I filed a request for a protective order and following the ignoring of my request, 3-4 armed gunmen have harassed me at my job on different occasions on behalf of the State of Louisiana, using Texas resources with no long arm. That is why the clerk of First Judicial, Mike Spence, stopped using the Texas Constable to harass me because I told the Constable he had no long arm. Then, someone authorized the use of the federal agents. The agents questioned me and brought me evidence that I had never seen before to my office in Texas from the original state case in which I was defendant, while we were in appeals against the state of Louisiana with me as the Plaintiff. They said Kristy Wilson went to the Caddo Clerk of Court and gave them a text message from me. I did not correspond with her in any way. The message DID NOT have my name or Kristy's name anywhere on it. It lacked my phone number, email address, social media handles or anything else that could identify me as the sender on March 16, 2020. I was falsely accused of violation of a permanent protective order, and could have been transferred into criminal proceedings. I call them gunman instead of law enforcement because there is still no jurisdiction. They entered private property, armed, with no jurisdiction to question about evidence from a state case.

Meanwhile in the appeals case, I filed an order to show cause for a judge's hearing or written order to get my brief approved that highlighted clearly broken laws by the Western district clerk, Tony R. Moore, that inhibited Mary C. Stewart's request for record excerpts and the federal rules do not require it. Louisiana's local rules can only be adhered to if I go back and beg the Western district for what they should have given me willingly the first time I asked. I have names and call logs to prove I requested it. Roy Brun et al. disobeyed the Fifth Circuit clerk's orders on 2 separate occasions, and it should have been called then in my favor as I formally requested in a motion, yet we continued and more gunman showed up to my job. The judge's rule supersedes the authority of the clerk so starting over was not necessary until Judge Oldham decided that he would now not accept the brief or rule on my protective orders without me going back to the Western District Clerk and asking for the record a second time. The Western district clerk is the reason we were in appeal in the first place. Under Tony Moore's direction, I was denied a summons to serve the Attorney General my complaint and summary judgment. After, I asked again and received the summons, I served the Attorney General. Meanwhile there was more cross-talk between Tony and Magistrate Hornsby to intervene. Magistrate Hornsby wrote a loose report and recommendation in which he tried to dismiss me for no service. I proved service before the rec and Judge Foote still agreed with Judge Hornsby on his unlawful recommendation. My summary judgment was ruled premature by Judge Foote, which allowed the rec from

Judge Hornsby. Judge Foote's only complaint about my summary judgment was that I had not served. I was still within my time to serve, I did not have all the summons, and was waiting on the Western District Clerk to give me the last one. I did not get served by Roy Brun et al. their complaints of no service. I have no idea how Tony knew I did not serve all the summons I had received while awaiting the final one. I did not tell him.

The First Judicial clerk filed false evidence with awareness, no police report to validate the claims, allowed untimely motions for protective orders with no merit, no service, no authorized legal long-arm, delayed my filings getting to a judge, allowed filings to be filed without a signature in lieu of my request to have a judge sign off, and is still holding my motion to change Judge and my four requests for appeal for the original cases have not been moved on. I have no notice of appeal granted or denied. That is why I enacted the next case in the Western District and proved malicious prosecution against Kristy et al. The Western District of Louisiana reported no jurisdiction over the federal subject. With that as the consensus, the lower First Judicial District court definitely had no subject matter jurisdiction to pass judgment against me about alleged internet only communication, no physical acts committed in the state of Louisiana, no personal jurisdiction over me, verbal confirmation from the Kristy et al, that we had no personal relationship, verbal confirmation from Kristy that evidence she was entering

was not correspondence from me to her or from me to a third party to give to her, and no threats of bodily harm, intent to injure, or endanger were included in the evidence. The Western District of Louisiana is defaulted with subject matter jurisdiction to undo the voided judgments of the lower court that the State of Louisiana passed to cover up crimes and have asked me to pay court costs for. Judge Hornsby enters again, in the same manner for the original malicious prosecution case.

Judge Hicks reported in his judgment that he was following the lead of Judge Hornsby's new R&R. I had submitted a summary judgment, prior to Hornsby filing his rec, served, and it was not contested by the defendants. I wrote a motion to disqualify Judge Hornsby, for partiality and no merit in his R&R for a textbook version of malicious prosecution based on fraud. Judge Hornsby and I had already determined in the previous original civil rights case against the State, that I did not agree with his ability to be impartial since he lied in the R&R in that case. In that case, he granted immunity to the Caddo Parish Clerk of Court based on him moving on Judge Brun's orders. Courts have repeatedly held that positive proof of the partiality of a judge is not a requirement, only the appearance of partiality. *Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 108 S.Ct. 2194 (1988) (what matters is not the reality of bias or prejudice but its appearance); *United States v. Balistrieri*, 779 F.2d 1191 (7th Cir. 1985) (Section 455(a) "is directed against the appearance of partiality, whether or not the judge is actually biased.") ("Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28

U.S.C. §455(a), is not intended to protect litigants from actual bias in their judge but rather to promote public confidence in the impartiality of the judicial process."). That Court also stated that Section 455(a) "requires a judge to recuse himself in any proceeding in which her impartiality might reasonably be questioned." *Taylor v. O'Grady*, 888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989). In *Pfizer Inc. v. Lord*, 456 F.2d 532 (8th Cir. 1972), the Court stated that "It is important that the litigant not only actually receive justice, but that he believes that he has received justice."

The Western District Clerk held my motions, delayed hearing setting for summary judgment past the customary 14 days as reported by his employee, and it was well over 60 days before the motions were transferred to the judge. After I gave the judge courtesy copies as requested, there was still no action on the summary judgment. I told Judge Hicks that Tony Moore mislabeled my motions as objections to recommendation of Judge Hornsby. I did not object. I wrote a motion to disqualify and labeled it as such. The second item labeled as an objection to the recommendation of Judge Hornsby is also not an objection from myself or the defendant. The second mislabeled "objection" was actually new evidence about Kristy manufacturing another message on May 16, 2020, to make it look like I violated the protective order. The cover page is present in the appendix to see the labeling. I contacted the LAWD clerk office, notified of the clerical error in labeling, they took it to chambers and refused to change it. I shared all that with Judge Hicks to further

prove error on the clerk and Kristy's fraudulent activity. Clerk Tony Moore also mislabeled my motion to rule as a motion to expedite as if we were ahead of schedule, and I was asking to be pushed to the head of the line. We were behind, and he was out of order.

This portion of the court system I have interacted with demonstrates behavior that makes me believe partiality and unfairness are common. They ruled and ruled again holding strong to beliefs that went directly against the evidence and the law. These judges consistently dismissed me without merit. I serve one God, and He judges fairly. I have behaved appropriately in my response to foolishness from the clerks, followed the rules, and told the truth. I have been asked to pay more money to do something we should have handled already. We are wasting time and resources. The Fifth circuit and the Western District had the opportunity to correct any remaining clerical errors or undo incorrect orders and judgments, as we were in the designated venue for that, and they chose not to.

#### **REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT**

To uphold the constitutional rights to a fair trial, to proceed without counsel with the knowing of impartiality and fairness by the court, and to express to the lower courts that acting in a manner that is unconstitutional is not conducive to a fair trial, especially when there is substantial evidence to prove a citizen has been falsely accused.

42 U.S. Code § 1983: Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

18 U.S.C. § 1503, provides: Whoever . . . corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense).

The Sixth Amendment reads as follows: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against

him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense." The original civil case in the First Judicial District between Wilson vs. Jackson would be the foundation of criminal proceedings, and injustice from the beginning cannot become justice if the law is not followed. Now, with Kristy Wilson as the defendant who is domicile to Louisiana, no court has jurisdiction to determine if she is a fraudulent criminal; however, they all claim jurisdiction to issue or allow me to keep 4 permanent protective orders with no evidence of harassment, stalking, or threats of injury or harm.

28 U.S. Code § 1654. Appearance personally or by counsel allows, in all courts of the United States the parties to plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel as, by the rules of such courts, respectively, are permitted to manage and conduct causes therein. I had 24hrs to assess the situation and obtain competent counsel in Louisiana for false allegations. I was focused on the safety of my patients first, the maintenance of my livelihood, and then these allegations because I knew they were false. That minimized my time to attain counsel even further. I was forced into proceedings without counsel, represented myself, and when deemed competent, my logic and the law were ignored.

Based on 28 U.S.C. § 455, U.S. Supreme Court held that "Disqualification is required if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's

impartiality. If a judge's attitude or state of mind leads a detached observer to conclude that a fair and impartial hearing is unlikely, the judge must be disqualified. " [Emphasis added]. *Liteky v. U.S.*, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994). The Supreme Court has ruled and has reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice", *Levine v. United States*, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960). Presiding over a case and entering judgments with no jurisdiction constitutes a voided judgment that can be easily corrected. Continuing to enter them, with no evidence and no jurisdiction or dismissing an original case without merit and thwarting appeals with no just cause can be considered fraud upon the court; a judge is not the court, as described in *People v. Zajic* 88 Ill.App.3d 477, 410 N.E.2d 626 (1980). In *Bullock v. United States*, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985), the court stated "Fraud upon the court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury. ... It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influence is attempted or where the judge has not performed his/her judicial function --- thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted. Should a judge issue any order after he has been disqualified by law, the judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity. It has been said that this judge, acting in this manner, has no more lawful authority than someone's next-door neighbor (provided that he is not a judge). I am a non-represented litigant, and the court did not follow the law

as to non-represented litigants, so the judge has expressed an "appearance of partiality" and, under the law, it would seem that he/she has disqualified him/herself. The Supreme Court has also held that if a judge wars against the Constitution, or if he acts without jurisdiction, he has engaged in treason to the Constitution.

If a judge acts after he has been automatically disqualified by law, then he is acting without jurisdiction, and that suggests that he is then engaging in criminal acts of treason. Courts have repeatedly ruled that judges have no immunity for their criminal acts.

### CONCLUSION

I am here to free myself from the injustice and civil rights violations committed by the State of Louisiana against me, with the lowest court never enacting jurisdiction over me. Louisiana has no proof I committed wrongdoing. I have enclosed a confession from a defendant/participant that states they were impersonating the non-profit organization called SCORE, by calling themselves SCORE with no legal formation. They also advertised and solicited money from the public on social media and have no proof of providing the specific service they were requesting the money for. The request was presented in Brun's court by the plaintiff against me saying I was asking her about that post on her public social media. Brun read the post requesting money and gave me the judgment. I have called the police and notified the IRS tax-exempt department about everyone involved. To my

knowledge, no arrests have been made based on the admission of guilt by the fraud ring.

I have a doctorate, am a professional woman, run a business, and I am not here to falsely accuse anyone. I value my life and my reputation. I did not initially accuse the State and its affiliates of being involved in the charity fraud. They were not visible to the public in the solicitation. The subsequent actions of the state; however, are covering up crimes while they grossly violate my civil rights. This has been happening to me since June 2019. It is almost June 2020. I understand this may be business as usual, but I do not make it a point to participate in court proceedings, so it is out of the ordinary for me, and I do not consent.

None of this stands because at every turn my civil rights have been violated and the State and Kristy et al broke actual laws. It is way too easy to be wrongfully accused and convicted in this country. I, in no way, profess to be well versed in the field of law. I was able to use the internet to find plain English definitions of what happened to me and after decisions were made in the courts of Louisiana against me, simple internet searches and the use of Cornell's Law website gave blatant, clear definitions of the laws that these decisions went against. My case and complaints were textbook definitions not erroneous interpretation of gray area. I was discriminated against as pro Se, a woman of color, and harassed as business owner

with several in-person visits and mailed correspondence to my place of business when I respectfully asked them to stay off the property and mail correspondence to an off site address. This had nothing to do with my business and my business partners did not need to be privy to my personal dealings, especially when I was being railroaded into judgments to cover someone else's crimes. I had my intelligence insulted as I was blatantly lied to by an entire legal system and expected to sit down, shut up, and look pretty while they do what they want with my life, against my will, without my consent because they got caught.

The Louisiana system appears lax about civil rights, but there is no just cause to violate mine. I request this writ application be granted to allow me all stated relief from my original complaints and summary judgments in the First Judicial, Western District, and US Fifth Circuit, including punitive damages, from everything that was allowed to happen as this case continued relentlessly and the defendants attacked my business and consumed my time for unwarranted accusations.

I am asking the Supreme Court to undo the actions of the lower courts. In addition to all previously stated relief, I ask that this court grant me complete expungement of all 4 cases that Judge Brun has illegally entered judgments in. I have been harassed enough.

Dr. NaKisha Jackson PT, DPT, WCS  
06/16/2020

Dr. NaKisha Jackson, PT, DPT, WCS